

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. AT9-93-110

In re Application of:

TIMOTHY M. SKERGAN

Serial No. 08/353,008

Filed: 9 DECEMBER 1994

For: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
MANIPULATING A PLURALITY
OF GRAPHICAL POINTERS**

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525

Examiner: **TRAN, V.**

Art Unit: 2609

REPLY BRIEF

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in triplicate in support of the Appeal in the above-identified application.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
37 CFR 1.8(A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D. C. 20231.

2-19-98
Date

[Signature]
Signature

ARGUMENT

In paragraph 2 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner erroneously states that Appellant's "brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal." Such a statement is given at page 2 of the Appeal Brief under the heading "RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES."

Next, in paragraph 7 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that the "rejection of claims 1-5, 6-9, and 10-14 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7)." Again, the Examiner is incorrect. Under the heading "GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS" at page 5 of the Appeal Brief, it states that "Claims 1-5 and 10-14 stand or fall together as a first group, and Claims 6-9 stand or fall together as a second group." Applicant need not provide reasons in support of the separate grouping of Claims 1-5 and 10-14 and Claims 6-9 because argument in support of the grouping of claims is required under 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) only in instances in which the appellant is arguing that multiple claims rejected based upon the same ground of rejection are separately patentable. When, as here, the Examiner has applied a different ground of rejection (i.e., a different reference) to each group of claims, Appellant need not argue that the claims are separately patentable.

The Examiner then states in paragraph 12 of the Examiner's Answer that the "examiner's answer does not contain any new ground of rejection." This, too, is wrong. In the Final Rejection dated April 24, 1997, and labelled Paper No. 6, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the *MacDraw Pro User's Guide* published by Claris Corporation (hereinafter, *Claris*). Claims 6-9 are separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Macintosh MacPaint* published by Apple Computer (hereinafter,


Apple). Now, at page 5, paragraph 3 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner impermissibly attempts to apply *Claris* to Claims 6-9 to compensate for the deficiencies in the Examiner's rejection noted at page 8 of Appellant's Appeal Brief. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Board instruct the Examiner that 37 C.F.R. § 1.193(a) prohibits the Examiner from introducing a new ground of rejection in the Examiner's Answer.

Finally, upon review of the Examiner's Answer, Appellant also notes that the Examiner has restated the rejection of the claims in the first group to clarify that the Examiner is relying upon the scroll buttons illustrated in Figure 1-17 of *Claris* to teach the plurality of graphical pointers (see, e.g., page 3, lines 14-16 of the Examiner's Answer), the switch (see, e.g., page 3, lines 16-18 of the Examiner's Answer), and the point (see, e.g., page 4, lines 15-17 of the Examiner's Answer) recited in the present claims. A careful examination of the language of Claim 1, however, reveals that *Claris* cannot identically disclose all of features of Claim 1 as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102, given the Examiner's application of the cited reference. For example, the Examiner's application of *Claris* to the step of "manipulating said one graphical pointer . . . during said selection of said one graphical pointer" requires *Claris* to disclose concurrent selection and manipulation of a scroll arrow. A review of *Claris* reveals that the cited reference fails to even disclose the selection of a scroll arrow, much less identically disclose the concurrent selection and manipulation of a scroll arrow. *Claris* similarly fails to identically disclose the step of "selecting a point within said display device in response to closure of a switch associated with said one graphical pointer" as recited in Claim 1. Assuming *arguendo* that the "switch" recited in Claim 1 is disclosed by *Claris*' scroll arrow as asserted by the Examiner, the "closure of a switch" recited in Claim 1 would correspond to the selection of a scroll arrow. Given that the Examiner also believes that *Claris*' scroll arrow discloses the "point" recited in Claim 1, the Examiner's interpretation of the selecting step recited in Claim 1 amounts to: "selecting a scroll arrow in response to selection of a scroll arrow." As should thus be apparent, the Examiner's deformation of the teaching

of *Claris* to obtain the present invention results in a nonsensical interpretation of the language of the present claims. Appellant therefore urges the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims.

No additional fee is believed to be required; however, in the event an additional fee is required please charge that fee to Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be required; however, in the event an extension of time is required, please consider that extension requested and please charge any associated fee therefore to the above-identified Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian F. Russell

Registration No. 40,796

FELSMAN, BRADLEY, GUNTER & DILLON, LLP

Suite 350 Arboretum Point

9505 Arboretum Boulevard

Austin, Texas 78759

(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT